

APR 23 1925

The Classical Weekly

Published weekly, on Monday, except in weeks in which there is a legal or School holiday, from October 1 to May 31, at
Barnard College, New York City. Subscription price, \$2.00 per volume.
Entered as second-class matter, November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of
March 3, 1879.
Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on
June 28, 1918.

VOL. XVIII, No. 22

MONDAY, APRIL 20, 1925

WHOLE No. 499

SATHER CLASSICAL LECTURES

In this series the problems of the classical scholar are treated in a critical and scientific spirit, but the form of presentation makes the volumes unusually attractive to the general reader. Three volumes are now ready. Others will be issued from time to time.

THE UNITY OF HOMER

By JOHN A. SCOTT
Professor of Greek in Northwestern University.

The most brilliant and forceful statement of the unitarian position in the long controversy that has raged since the appearance of Wolf's *Prolegomena*

AESCHYLEAN TRAGEDY

By HERBERT WEIR SMYTH
Eliot Professor of Greek Literature in Harvard University.

A rare intuition has been here combined with an unusual creative faculty to set forth, for the enjoyment of the reader, the charm, the nobility, and the supreme art of Aeschylus, perhaps the greatest dramatic genius the world has ever known.

HERODOTUS

By T. R. GLOVER
Fellow of St. John's College and Public Orator in
the University of Cambridge.

An attractive study of the "Father of History" by one of the most eminent of modern historians. The sympathetic and imaginative treatment gives the volume especial interest for the general reader, and the work is as authoritative as it is brilliant and fascinating.

All who wish to possess complete sets of the Sather Classical Lectures should send in their orders promptly; the editions are not large and some of the volumes will soon be out of print.

The price for each volume is \$3.50 postpaid. The three volumes, if purchased together, may be had for \$10.00 postpaid.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PRESS THE CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
Berkeley, California London, England

It pays to use the Best Editions

*The Classical Investigation specifically recommends
the following Ginn editions for reading in Latin*

Collar's New Gradatim
Collar's Via Latina
D'Ooge's Easy Latin for Sight Reading
D'Ooge's Viri Romae
Moore's Porta Latina
Paxson's Two Latin Plays
Schlicher's Latin Plays

Ginn and Company

Boston New York Chicago Atlanta Dallas Columbus San Francisco

"True Latin" For First Year Reading

"We are using Gallup's Latin Reader in the rapid-development grade of our Junior High School with a good deal of success. It is very popular with the pupils, who are pleased to read in Latin fables and stories with which they are already familiar. The excellent points of the book are the short units or chapters which help the pupil to a sense of definite accomplishment; the excellent choice of material from classical sources. Also, it is easy enough to be well within the range of ability of first year pupils".

(Quotation from a recent letter)

Gallup's Latin Reader--Easy Selections for Beginners

List Price, \$.60

Recommended in the Report of the Classical Investigation for use in the second semester of the first year.

AMERICAN BOOK COMPANY

NEW YORK CINCINNATI CHICAGO BOSTON ATLANTA

The Classical Weekly

VOL. XVIII, No. 22

MONDAY, APRIL 20, 1925

WHOLE No. 499

AGAIN THE LOEB CLASSICAL LIBRARY

(Continued from page 163)

(4) *Lyra Graeca*, Being the Remains of All the Greek Lyric Poets from Eumelus to Timotheus Excepting Pindar, II, by J. M. Edmonds.

The contents are as follows:

Echembrotus <2-3>; Sacadas, Life <4-11>; Xanthus <12-13>; Stesichorus, Life <14-30>; Fragments <30-77>; Ibycus, Life <78-84>; Fragments <84-119>; Anacreon, Life <120-135>; Poems and Fragments <136-221>; Lasus, Life <222-227>; Fragments <228-231>; Apollodorus <232-233>; Tynnichus <234-235>; Telesilla, Life <236-242>; Fragments <242-245>; Simonides, Life <246-271>; Poems and Fragments <272-417>; Timocreon, Life <418-420>; Poems and Fragments <420-426>; Tables of Comparative Numeration <431-443>; List of 'New' Fragments <444>; Index of Authors <445-453>; General Index of Names <454-470>.

The "Tables of Comparative Numeration" compare the numeration adopted in this edition with those followed by Bergk in his *Poetae Lyrici Graeci* (1882), and by Hiller-Crusius in their *Anthologia Lyrica* (1913).

It is not necessary to add any details concerning the work of Mr. Edmonds to what I said in my notice of his first volume, *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 16.185-186. Various reviewers condemned Mr. Edmonds's arbitrary handling of the text of the fragments which he discusses in that volume (see e.g. Paul Shorey, *Classical Philology* 18.188-189, E. Lobel, *The Classical Review* 36.120-121). Surely, if there is any place in the world for conservatism, that place is in the handling of fragments. How little affected Mr. Edmonds is likely to be by any criticisms may be seen from the concluding paragraph of his Preface (vi):

I may be allowed to add that the one wholly unfavourable criticism published of my first volume will be found to be fully answered partly in the *Classical Review* for November 1922 <36. 159-161> and partly in the above volume of the Cambridge Philological Society's *Proceedings* <for 1922>.

(5) *Velleius Paterculus and Res Gestae Divi Augusti*, by Frederick W. Shipley, of Washington University, St. Louis.

The contents are as follows:

C. Velleius Paterculus <viii-329>; Introduction <viii-xvii>; The Text <xviii-xix>; Bibliography <xx>; Sigla <xxi>; Text and Translation <2-329>; *Res Gestae Divi Augusti* <332-405>; Introduction <332-337>; The Text <338-339>; The Historical Notes <340>; Bibliography <341-343>; Text, Greek and Latin both, and Translation <344-405>; Index <406-432>.

Professor Shipley writes in an interesting way (viii-xvii) of the Life and Work of Velleius Paterculus.

By way of sample of his translations, I append the text and the rendering of Velleius 2.32.4-2.33, a passage which has direct bearing upon Cicero's oration concerning the Manilian Law.

At Cn. Pompeius multis et praeclaris viris in id bellum adsumptis discriptoque paene in omnis recessus maris praesidio navium, brevi inexcuperabili manu terrarum orbem liberavit praedonesque saepe multis iam aliis locis victos circa Ciliciam classe adgressus fudit ac fugavit; et quo maturius bellum tam late diffusum conficeret, reliquias eorum contractas in urbibus remotoque mari loco in certa sede constituit. Sunt qui hoc carpant, sed quamquam in auctore satis rationis est, tamen ratio quemlibet magnum auctorem faceret; data enim facultate sine rapto vivendi rapinis arcuit.

Meanwhile Gnaeus Pompey enlisted the services of many illustrious men, distributed detachments of the fleet to all the recesses of the sea, and in a short time with an invincible force he freed the world from the menace of piracy. Near the Cilician coast he delivered his final attack upon the pirates, who had already met with frequent defeats in many other places, and completely routed them. Then, in order that he might the more quickly put an end to a war that spread over so wide an area, he collected the remnants of the pirates and established them in fixed abodes in cities far from the sea. Some criticize him for this; but although the plan is sufficiently recommended by its author, it would have made its author great whoever he might have been; for, by giving the pirates the opportunity to live without brigandage, he restrained them from brigandage.

Readers of *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* ought to be deeply interested in the second and shorter part of Professor Shipley's volume, that part which deals with the *Monumentum Ancyranum*, or the *Res Gestae Divi Augusti*. The Introduction to this part deals with the circumstances under which, in modern times, the fragments were found. On page 340, under the caption *The Historical Notes*, Professor Shipley explains that, for the benefit both of the general reader and of the student of history, "the translation has been supplemented by historical notes, to amplify or explain the statements of the first emperor, which are throughout characterized by epigraphic brevity". It was a wise decision to append these notes, which are of considerable compass.

The *Monumentum Ancyranum* is of very great importance. All teachers of Vergil should know thoroughly (1) the ancient Lives of Vergil, in the original, together with such commentaries and articles upon them as they can find (see *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 11.2-3), and (2) the *Monumentum Ancyranum*. The latter is now accessible in several works which are easily obtained. The text, Greek and Latin, may be found in the following works:

(a) William Fairley, *Monumentum Ancyranum, The Deeds of Augustus*, in *Translations and Reprints*

from the Original Sources of European History, Volume V, No. 1, Published by the Department of History of the University of Pennsylvania (Philadelphia, 1898). This book contains an Introduction (5-11), which discusses I. History of the Inscription (5-7), II. Character and Purpose of the Inscription (7-8), III. Divisions of the Text (8-9), IV. The Greek Version (9), V. The Supplement (9), VI. Trustworthiness of the Inscription (9), VII. Masons' Blunders (10), VIII. Signs and Abbreviations (10-11); Text, Greek and Latin, and Translation, and a very considerable body of notes (12-85). As the pioneer work in English on the Monumentum Ancyranum this book deserves considerable praise.

(b) *Res Gestae Divi Augusti: Das Monumentum Ancyranum*, by Ernst Diehl (Bonn, Marcus und Weber, 1918). The book contains a very brief Introduction or Preface (2-3), text, Greek and Latin, with brief critical and explanatory notes (4-47). This is the cheapest form in which the text can be obtained. The price marked on the volume, which is paper-covered, is 1.60 M.

(c) Professor Shipley's volume, discussed above.

(d) *The Monumentum Ancyranum*, Edited by E. G. Hardy (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1923. Pp. 167). This is reviewed in the current issue of THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY, 178-179, by Professor W. L. Westermann.

In 1903, an English scholar, E. S. Schuckburgh, well known for many contributions to classical studies, in particular a translator: in four volumes of all the Letters of Cicero, published a biography of Augustus, entitled *Augustus: The Life and Times of the Founder of the Roman Empire* (London, Unwin). On pages 293-301, Mr. Schuckburgh gave a translation, without commentary, of the Monumentum Ancyranum.

(6) Ovid, *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto*, by Professor Arthur Leslie Wheeler of Bryn Mawr College.

The contents are as follows:

Introduction <vii-xliv: Life, vii-xxxix, The Text, xxxix-xli, Selected Bibliography, xlii-xliv>; *Tristia* <2-261>; *Epistulae Ex Ponto* <264-489>; Index <491-510>.

The works of Ovid contained in this volume are of very great importance because upon them we have to rely in large part for our knowledge of Ovid's life. As everybody knows, they are the poems written by Ovid during his banishment at Tomi.

Professor Wheeler's discussion of the facts of Ovid's life is marked by the independence and scholarly accuracy which characterize all his published work. The part of the Introduction which will be of most interest, naturally, will be that which deals with the cause or causes of Ovid's banishment (xvii-xxiv). The discussion of the two charges against Ovid—*duo crimina, carmen et error*—is eminently sane. Professor Wheeler accepts Ovid's own statement that the publication of the *Ars Amatoria* was the chief charge in the indictment against him (xix-xx). Of the *error*, or *culpa*, he writes as follows (xxiii):

... It seems, therefore, very improbable that the evil of which he became cognizant was anything so heinous

as the profligacy of the younger Julia, who was banished at about the same time as the poet. Ovid refers, it is true, to his fault as an offence against Augustus, as a "wound", an "injury" to him, but such phrases need not imply that the offence concerned the imperial household. Any offence against the state, or that which Augustus regarded as the interest of the state, was an injury to the ruler.

Augustus's own attitude, as shown by Ovid, indicates that the poet's sin was not a very heavy one. To say nothing of the comparatively mild conditions of Ovid's *relegatio*, which he himself urges as a proof of the Emperor's estimate, the poet and his friends were allowed to correspond freely, and he was allowed to publish poetry appealing openly to Augustus and to many others. It is plain that Augustus and after his death Tiberius, who continued so religiously the policies of his predecessor, were quite satisfied merely to have Ovid out of the way. . . .

Professor Wheeler thus sums up his discussion (xxv, note):

... The translator, after a fresh study of all the evidence, agrees with Boissier (and Ehwald) that the chief cause of exile was the *Ars amat.* and that the *culpa* merely gave Augustus a pretext, but he differs from Boissier as to the nature of the *culpa*. The evidence shows that the *culpa* could not have been *in itself* anything very serious.

Professor Wheeler declares (xvi) that "Ovid was ordered into exile" in A. D. 8 (compare xi); he does not, however, discuss the matter. An English scholar, Mr. S. G. Owen, argues in favor of this date, in his *P. Ovidi Nasonis Tristium Liber Secundus*, Edited With An Introduction, Translation, and Commentary (Oxford University Press, 1924. See pages 8-9). On pages 10-32 Mr. Owen discusses, very minutely, the question of the cause or causes of Ovid's banishment. The *Ars Amatoria* was "a real cause of his punishment" (10); "The *Ars Amatoria* is constantly described as a direct cause of his banishment. . ." (11). With respect to the error, or *culpa*, Mr. Owen attempts, for himself, no definite statement. After detailed examination of all relevant factors, he rejects the "theory of Boissier and of all those who connect Ovid with Julia's adultery. . ." (24). He thinks that "The source of Ovid's misfortune. . . was probably political rather than domestic" (26). But, in a thoroughly rational discussion (26-31), he rejects the view, sponsored especially by Némethy, that Ovid was in some way connected with a plot to rehabilitate the fortunes of Agrippa Postumus, the exiled grandson of Augustus. His conclusions appear in these sentences (31): "Ovid did not intend his secret to be revealed, and unrevealed it must remain. It seems probable, however, that his unknown action was political and gave offence to Livia and Tiberius".

As a specimen of Professor Wheeler's handiwork as a translator, I give his version of *Tristia* 4.10. 1-64—the most important autobiographical passage in Ovid's work:

That thou mayst know who I was, I that playful poet of tender love whom thou reade'st, hear my words, thou of the after time. Sulmo is my native place, a land rich in ice-cold streams, thrice thirty miles from the city. There first I saw the light, and if thou wouldst know the date, 'twas when both consuls fell under stress of like fate. I was heir to rank (if rank is aught)

that came from forefathers of olden time—no knight fresh made by fortune's gift. I was not the first born, for my birth befell after that of a brother, thrice four months my senior. The same day-star beheld the birth of us both: one birthday was celebrated by the offering of our two cakes—that day among the five sacred to armed Minerva which is wont to be the first stained by the blood of combat. While still of tender age we began our training, and through our father's care we came to attend upon men of the city distinguished in the liberal arts. My brother's bent even in the green of years was oratory: he was born for the stout weapons of the wordy forum. But to me even as a boy service of the divine gave delight and stealthily the Muse was ever drawing me aside to do her work. Often my father said, "Why do you try a profitless pursuit? Even the Maonian left no wealth". I was influenced by what he said and wholly forsaking Helicon I tried to write words freed from rhythm, yet all unbidden song would come upon befitting numbers and whatever I tried to write was verse.

Meanwhile as the silent-pacing years slipped past we brothers assumed the toga of a freer life and our shoulders put on the broad stripe of purple while still our pursuits remained as before. And now my brother had seen but twice ten years of life when he passed away, and thenceforth I was bereft of half myself. I advanced so far as to receive the first office granted to tender youth, for in those days I was one third of the board of three. The senate house awaited me, but I narrowed my purple stripe: that was a burden too great for my powers. I had neither a body to endure the toil nor a mind suited to it; by nature I shunned the worries of an ambitious life and the Aonian sisters were ever urging me to seek the security of a retirement I had ever chosen and loved.

The poets of that time I fondly revered: all bards I thought so many present gods. Ofttimes Macer, already advanced in years, read to me of the birds he loved, of noxious snakes and healing plants. Ofttimes Propertius would declaim his flaming verse by right of the comradeship that joined him to me. Ponticus famed in epic, Bassus also, famed in iambics, were pleasant members of that friendly circle. And Horace of the many rhythms held in thrall our ears while he attuned his fine-wrought songs to the Ausonian lyre. Vergil I only saw, and to Tibullus greedy fate gave no time for friendship with me. Tibullus was thy successor, Gallus, and Propertius his; after them came I, fourth in order of time. And as I revered older poets so was I revered by the younger, for my Thalia was not slow to become renowned. When first I read my youthful songs in public, my beard had been cut but once or twice. My genius had been stirred by her who was sung throughout the city, whom I called, not by a real name, Corinna. Much did I write, but what I thought defective I gave in person to the flames for their revision. Even when I was setting forth into exile I burned certain verse that would have found favour, for I was angry with my calling and with my songs.

(To be Concluded)

CHARLES KNAPP

THE HITTITE TABLETS FROM BOGHHAZ KEVI

In 1906 and 1907 Hugo Winkler, the Assyriologist, discovered, at Boghaz Kevi, in Central Asia Minor, the royal library of the Hittite kings of the thirteenth century B. C. The documents discovered include many thousands of tablets or parts of tablets of burnt clay. It is estimated that, with the fragments pieced together, between 500 and 1,000 tablets can be read completely or in large part. Since most of them are in-

scribed on each side with two columns containing from 40 to 112 lines each, it will be seen that the total amount of text is considerable. In addition there are two Hittite letters from Tell-el-Amarna in Egypt, and a tablet from Yuzgat, which has been published by Sayce¹. A number of Hittite tablets have been acquired from traders by the British Museum and the Louvre. Those in the British Museum have been published by King².

The interpretation of the documents from Boghaz Kevi was facilitated by several circumstances. In the first place, the tablets are written in cuneiform characters of known phonetic or other value. Some of them are in the Babylonian language, and these were interpreted without difficulty. The approximate sound of the Hittite words was also easy for Babylonian scholars to fix. Furthermore, the Hittite texts contain many Sumerian-Babylonian ideograms (i. e. characters analogous to our &, \$, +, %), and even phonetically written Babylonian words (compare our use of abbreviated Latin words, as etc., i. e., e. g.). These two classes of words were clear at once, and they yielded the sense of many passages before the non-Babylonian words were understood at all. In the third place, the fact that the Hittite scribes used Sumerian word-signs and Babylonian words in writing their own language made it necessary for them to study these two languages. As an aid to such study trilingual Sumerian-Babylonian-Hittite dictionaries were composed, and some fragments of these have come to light³. Last, but not least, the two Hittite letters from Tell-el-Amarna had already been interpreted, as it now appears, with substantial accuracy, by J. A. Knudston⁴. All in all the task of interpretation was not particularly difficult for a competent scholar.

Nevertheless, the reading and the interpretation of the Hittite inscriptions was hindered, first, by the death of their discoverer, and then by the Great War. Late in 1915 a sensational report was circulated that Friedrich Hrozný, a Czechish Assyriologist, had read the documents, and that they proved to be written in an Indo-European language closely related to Latin. During the next four years there appeared Hrozný's Grammar of Hittite⁵, in which he sought to prove his thesis, and a selection of texts, which was to provide a basis for the Grammar⁶. These works at once became the center of a lively discussion of the question whether Hittite was or was not an Indo-European language; and when, about the end of 1919, the censors allowed Hrozný's books to reach America, the discussion was taken up here.

It was unfortunate that the matter was handled in this way. The texts should have been published and

¹Archibald H. Sayce, *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* (1920), 70-83.

²Leonard W. King, *Hittite Texts in the Cuneiform Character from Tablets in the British Museum* (London, British Museum, 1920).

³Published by Delitsch in *Abhandlungen der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* (1914), No. 3 (49 pages).

⁴Die Zwei Arzawa-Briefe, *Die Ältesten Urkunden in Indogermanischen Sprache* (Leipzig, Hinrichs, 1902).

⁵Die Sprache der Hethiter, *Ihre Bau und Ihre Zugehörigkeit zum Indogermanischen Sprachstamm* (Leipzig, Hinrichs, 1916-1917); *Hethitische Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazköi* (Leipzig, Hinrichs, 1919).

interpreted before attention was distracted by the astonishing claim that Hittite was Indo-European. That claim was merely a vexation as long as the basis for it was locked up in the museums of Berlin and Constantinople. Even the texts published in 1919 left room for doubt, at least in the minds of those who were unfamiliar with cuneiform writing and with the sound work which Hrozný had to his credit in that field.

The reason why Hrozný proceeded as he did was that his compulsory service in the trenches made it doubtful how far he could get with his task if he went about it methodically. By announcing his discovery at once, and then publishing the Grammar before the texts he made sure that his name would be connected with the discovery when the world should have leisure to read the texts. It is hard to blame him for taking this course; but, for the time being, it led to doubts about the validity of his theory, and it postponed the more fundamental task of publishing and translating the documents.

It was at once apparent that, if the facts were as Hrozný alleged, Hittite must be Indo-European. After summarizing the evidence, Professor C. D. Buck says: ". . . in the aggregate, the resemblances mentioned above, if the Hittite forms are correctly identified, make a too formidable array to be explained away as accidental. Taken at face value, they point to a dominant Indo-European element in Hittite inflection. All depends upon the correctness of the author's interpretation and identification of the grammatical forms". Similarly Professor Maurice Bloomfield says: "One thing was clear without further ado: if his illustrations were based upon sound decipherment of the cuneiform characters; if his translations were impeccable; if the resulting speech units admitted no other linguistic interpretations than those proposed, and if they did not represent merely a small selection of Indo-European assonances, such as any language might furnish; then Hittite must be Indo-European".

In short, everything depended upon the texts and their interpretation, and there the matter had to rest. But at the time when America first saw Hrozný's Grammar, and when the words just quoted were written, the necessary foundations were already being laid. Since 1916 there has been an increasing stream of published texts, translations, and special articles on various points of interpretation⁶. Aside from Hrozný himself, perhaps the most important contributors have been Emil Forrer and Johannes Friedrich. Most gratifying to Indo-European students is the fact that Ferdinand Sommer, the author of the well-known

Latin Grammar, has devoted himself to Hittite for several years past.

Hrozný's work stands the test! There have been many corrections of detail, but in general he had deciphered and translated correctly. His Grammar is essentially sound, as far as it is a description of the Hittite language itself. It contains many impossible etymologies, and those that are correct are often improperly stated; but the important thing is that the conditions laid down by Professors Buck and Bloomfield (see above) have in general been met. Hittite is clearly akin to the Indo-European languages⁷.

The evidence for the character of the language is in the main that adduced by Hrozný, and already summarized in a dozen magazine articles. It may be worth while, however, to repeat here a few of the most striking items.

The Hittite noun makes the masculine-feminine nominative singular with the ending *s*, except in the consonant declension, while the accusative singular ends in *n* (for original *m*). The neuter has no suffix in the nominative singular, and the accusative neuter is always like the nominative. The genitive singular ends in *as*, and the dative-locative in *i*, which may represent original *i* or original *ei*. There are some traces of ablaut in the noun: e. g. nominative singular *idāl-u-s*, genitive singular *idāl-uv-as*, dative singular *idāl-av-i*. Most remarkable is the alternation of *r* and *n*, as in Latin *femur*, *feminis*, *ῥῶμα*, *ῥῶμος* (earlier *ῥῶμος*), etc.: the type is illustrated by Hittite *vādar*, *vedēnas*, 'water', cognate with *ῥῶμα*.

The Hittite pronouns show some remarkable parallels with Indo-European. Most striking are *kuis* = *quis*, *kuin* = *quem*, *kuit* = *quid*, *kuiski* = *quisque*, *kuinki* = *quemque*, *kuitki* = *quidque*, *tal* = Sanskrit *tad* (the corresponding masculine-feminine is *tas*), and the enclitic possessives *mis* = *meus*, *tis* = *tuus*, *sis* = *suus*.

The verb 'to be' appears in the present indicative as *esmi* (first person singular), *eszi* (third person singular), *asanzi* (third person plural); the imperative has in the second person, singular and plural, *es* and *esten*, in the third person, *esdu* and *asandu*. There is a passive in *r*, corresponding to that of Latin and Celtic: the third person singular ends in *tari* (Latin *tur*), and the third person plural in *ntari* (Latin *ntur*). There are many other verbal and nominal terminations that are as surely, although less obviously, akin to Indo-European.

It is chiefly the morphology of Hittite that gives us a clue to the origin of the language. The vocabulary apparently consists chiefly of loan-words. Nevertheless, there are several attractive Indo-European etymologies, and a new one is noticed from time to time. Here are a few of them: *adazi* = Latin *edit*, *arras* = *ῥῶπος*, 'anus', *artari* = Latin *oritur*, *arnuzi* = *ῥῥῶσι*, *dāj* = Sanskrit *dhā*, 'to place', *genu* = Latin *genu*, *chuis* = Sanskrit *jw* and Latin *vivere*, *kuenti* = Sans-

⁶Classical Philology 15 (1920), 189.

⁷Journal of the American Oriental Society 41 (1921), 195.

⁸The first texts to appear were published in cuneiform characters in Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazköi, edited by H. H. Figulla and others (Leipzig, Hinrichs, 1916-1919); but, in order to save expense, they are now appearing in transliteration, under the title, Keilschrifturkunden aus Boghazköi (Berlin, Staatliche Museen, 1921-). Some of the texts originally published in cuneiform are appearing in Latin characters, in Emil Forrer, Die Boghazköi-Texte im Umschrift (Leipzig, 1922-). Among the translations may be named those of Heinrich Zimmern and Johannes Friedrich, Hethitische Gesetze aus dem Staatsarchiv von Boghazköi, published in Der Alte Orient 23 (1922), Heft 2 (32 pages); Johannes Friedrich, Der Hethitische Soldateneid, published in Zeitschrift für Assyriologie 35 (1924), 161-191; and Ferdinand Sommer and Hans Ehelolf, Das Hethitische Ritual des Papanikri, published in Boghazköi-Studien 19 (1924).

⁹So Ferdinand Sommer, Orientalistische Literaturzeitung 24 (1921), 317, and Gustav Herbig, Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen 183 (1921), 193-218. Sayce's opinion (see most recently Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society [1924], 245-255), that certain features of Indo-European inflection were borrowed by a non-Indo-European language runs counter to all that we know about linguistic borrowing.

krit hanti, 'he slays', *lukizzi*, 'he kindles' = Latin *lucet*, *nebis*, 'sky' (an *s*-stem) = *néphos*, 'cloud', *pedas*, 'a place' = *πέδον*, 'the ground', *σ(ι)πανδανσι* = *σπένδουσι*, *ves* = Sanskrit *vas*, 'clothe' (compare Latin *vestis*), *vestaras* = Avestan *vāstar*, 'shepherd'.

I hasten to add that seemingly obvious etymologies, including, perhaps, some of the above, will have to be discarded when the phonetic laws have been fully worked out¹⁰.

I have omitted several etymologies that have been urged as evidence. Hittite *mallanzi*, 'they grind in a mill', and *mijalla*, 'mill', are to be connected with *μύλη*, Latin *mola*, etc., but I have shown¹¹ that the latter words were borrowed from pre-Indo-European languages of the Mediterranean region. No doubt Hittite borrowed from the same source. Similarly, Hittite *kammaris*, 'bee hive', *καμάρα*, and Latin *camera* are probably all loan-words. Hittite *kuirvanas* = *κόλπανος* shows that the latter word originally had digamma after the *p*, and thus disproves all the Indo-European etymologies for it hitherto proposed. Probably both Hittite and Greek borrowed the word from an Aegean language.

In spite of all the evidence of kinship with the Indo-European languages, Hittite is strangely unlike what we should expect an Indo-European language of the second millennium B. C. to be. Hitherto in our experience the more ancient Indo-European languages have converged toward one another and toward the parent speech from which all are derived. No student of Sanskrit and Greek can fail to note the resemblances between them. The similarity of Latin and Greek is largely due to the early date of the documents and their consequent relative closeness in time to the common origin of the two languages. Gothic is much more similar to Sanskrit, Greek, and Latin than are the more recent Germanic tongues. But Hittite, although more ancient than any of the others, has a mere remnant of the Indo-European conjugation; and the declension, for all it has six cases, does not approach Greek, to say nothing of Latin and Sanskrit, in conservatism. This is in spite of the fact that it is precisely the forms of declension and conjugation which most clearly demonstrate the Indo-European affinities of the language! In vocabulary, Hittite is no nearer to primitive Indo-European than are the modern European languages. In fact, so wide a divergence from the type requires us to assume not only some unusually strong outside influence, but also a separation of some thousands of years. Probably Forrer¹² is right in thinking that the Hittite language broke away from the common stem long before the other known branches. In other words, Hittite is to be thought of as a sister language to the parent speech of Sanskrit, Greek, Latin, etc.

The language which we have been discussing was the official language of the Hittite State. In it about nine-

tenths of the documents from Boghaz Kevi are written. But, in addition to the Sumerian and the Babylonian texts already mentioned, there are more or less extensive records of five other languages, making eight in all. Four of these are preserved in ritual texts, in which the celebrant is directed to address certain gods in the languages presumably most familiar and agreeable to them, that is, in the languages of the cities from which the Hittites had taken the gods concerned. Fortunately, the ritual prescriptions name these languages. The phrase runs: 'Then the reciter recites *Churlili* <or *Luvili*, or *Palāumnili*, or *Chattili*>'. Now the last one of the adverbs just cited evidently means 'in Hittite', and yet it always designates a passage in a language different from the official language of the Hittite State. Hence, to quote Herbig (in the work cited in note 9, page 212), "Das Hetthitisch ist indogermanisch aber es ist nicht hethitisch". Consequently it has been suggested that we should adopt some different name for the prevailing language and reserve the term Hittite for the speech which the Hittites themselves called thus. What new name we should choose, however, is not clear; apparently the majority will continue to call the official language Hittite, while designating the language of the *Chattili*-ritual as Proto-Hittite.

It seems probable that Proto-Hittite¹³ was the language of the Hittite kings before the capital was moved from Kussar, in Cappadocia, to Chattusas (i. e. Boghaz Kevi). In the Hittite tablets several early predecessors of the monarchs of Chattusas are referred to as Kings of Kussar. In the Assyrian tablets of 2400 to 2200 B. C., discovered at Kara Eyuk in Cappadocia, the leading power of the region is called Kursaura (Γαροῦρα in Strabo and Ptolemy), no doubt a fuller form for Hittite Kussar. The capital of Kursaura is named Arinna, which is the Proto-Hittite word for 'wells'; no doubt it is the place which Ptolemy calls *Φλέρα*. Even after the establishment of the new capital, the Hittite kings continued to bear Proto-Hittite names. Even the national name *Chatti* is a Proto-Hittite word meaning 'silver', and the new capital itself was given a Proto-Hittite name, *Chattu-sas*, 'Silverton'. Why the language of the court was changed, we do not know.

Closely connected with this linguistic puzzle is another. Hieroglyphic inscriptions have been found in various parts of the Hittite realm, especially in Northern Syria, where the Hittite power persisted after the fall of Chattusas. These documents have not yet been interpreted, and we cannot tell whether they are written in Proto-Hittite or in Hittite or in some other language.

Of the other three languages which occur in the ritual texts from Boghaz Kevi, Luvian seems to be related to Hittite, and consequently to Indo-European. Churrian appears to be only dialectically different from the Mittanian of Northern Mesopotamia. Scarcely anything is yet known about Palaomnian, except that it makes large use of prefixes.

¹⁰See Sayce, *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 42 (1923), 44-49, and *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* (1924), 245-255.

¹¹The most elaborate study of Hittite phonology so far is Carl Marstrand, *Caractère Indo-Européen de la Langue Hittite*, published in *Skrifter utgit av Videnskabselskabet i Kristiania* (1918) II, No. 2 (172 pages). Marstrand's results are, however, unreliable because they are based upon too few documents.

¹²Proceedings of the American Philological Association 50 (1919), xiv.

¹³*Mitteilungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft* 61 (1921), 26.

There remains an eighth language, which is represented only by some dozen technical terms in a treatise on the feeding and training of race horses, written by a certain Kikkuli, of Mitanni. These terms, oddly enough, prove to be Sanskrit. The clearest of them are compounds consisting of the five odd numerals *aika*, *tēra* (from *traya*), *pañca*, *satta*, and *nava*, and the noun *varṭanna*, which here means 'turn <about the stadium>', or 'lap'. Particularly noteworthy is a phrase containing the locative of one of these compounds followed by the genitive of the noun for 'stadium'; *nāvarṭanni vasanāsaja* is a transparent disguise for *navavartane vasanasya*, 'in nine laps of the stadium'¹⁴.

So much for the languages of the new Hittite documents.

Of even greater interest, perhaps, is their content. There are abundant materials for a history of the Hittite monarchy up to the fall of Chattusas about 1190 B. C. The interpretation and combination of these is far from complete; consequently the following brief outline must be regarded as purely tentative. The Assyrian tablets from Kara Eyuk (see above, page 173, column 2) belong to a time when Central Asia Minor was a prosperous mining region, supplying copper and silver to the wealthy communities of Mesopotamia and Egypt. The political hegemony of the region then belonged to the land of Kursaura, the record of whose kings goes back as far as 2800 B. C. About 1800 B. C. the royal residence was transferred from Arinna in Kursaura (Hittite Kussar) to Chattusas. Apparently the change of capital was not accompanied by a change of dynasty; some of the later Hittite kings trace their descent from the kings of Kussar. Not long after the transfer of the capital there followed an interval of some two centuries during which the Hittites were subordinate to a Syrian power. About 1500 the foreign yoke was thrown off, and from then until about 1190 the kings of Chattusas were supreme throughout Asia Minor, and, most of the time, in Syria also. It was during the last third of this period that the library at Chattusas (Boghaz Kevi) was maintained. Nearly all of the extant documents date from the thirteenth century, although some of them are copies of earlier tablets.

It is hardly necessary to say that the texts have little literary merit. By way of example I give a translation of the account by king Mursilis of the correspondence between his father, Subbiluljumas, and the widow of a certain king of Egypt. The identity of the Egyptian king is not certain; he may have been either Akhenaten or Tutankhamen, although the name quoted below from Mursilis is quite unlike either¹⁵.

¹⁴*Vasanam* seems to occur in our Sanskrit texts only as an abstract noun, meaning 'a tarrying', 'a dwelling', but it may well have had a concrete sense, 'dwelling', 'village', 'camp'. It appears from our Hittite treatise that the *vasanam* consisted of a nearly rectangular stockade, around the outside of which the horses were driven. Probably the stockade was originally a protection thrown about a village or a camp.

¹⁵I have put into English the German translation published by Heinrich Zimmern and Johannes Friedrich, in *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 35 (1923), 37-42. Dots indicate words not yet understood, while gaps due to mutilation of the tablet are indicated by square brackets. The capitals in the name Chatu-AMEL-is represent an Assyrian ideogram whose phonetic value in Hittite is still unknown.

But when the people of the land of Egypt heard of the destruction of Amka, they were afraid. And their lord Bibchururias was . . . dead. And the queen of Egypt who was . . . , sent to my father an emissary and wrote him as follows: "My husband is dead, and I have not a son. But they say that you have many sons. If you should give me a son of yours, then he shall be my husband. Should I select a slave of mine and make him my husband (and) honor. . . ?" When my father had heard thus, he called the gr[eat] to counsel. . . and. . . [t]o Egypt he sent Chattu-AMEL-is [. . .]: "Go; bring me back reliable information. No doubt they are making sport of me; no doubt they have a successor to the throne. Bring me back reliable information".

Now when Chattu-AMEL-is returned from Egypt, in the meantime my father had destroyed the city of Carchemish. <Then follows in fourteen lines an account of the siege, the conquest, and the booty>.

The emissary from Egypt, the lord Chanis, came to him. And when my father heard that Chattu-AMEL-is was in Egypt, he gave him the following commission: "No doubt they have a successor to the throne, and they are making sport of me; and they do not want any son of mine to be king". The Queen of Egypt answered my father with a letter as follows: "Why have you spoken thus: 'They are making sport of me'? If I had a son, then would I my people and my country. . . have I written to another country. And you have not to me. . . and you have instead spoken to me thus. He who was my husband is dead; and I have no son. Should I select a slave of mine and make him my husband? I have not written to any other country. They say you have many sons; give me one of your sons as my husband and as King of Egypt". My father, being friendly, yielded to the lady's words, and interested himself in his son's behalf.

We learn elsewhere that the son of Subbiluljumas, who was sent to Egypt, was assassinated by Egyptian officials, who did not approve of the queen's plan to import a sovereign.

In general the Hittite documents impress one as thoroughly Oriental. They do not approach the clarity and the perspective of Greek literature much more closely than do the writings of Babylonia and Egypt. In two respects, however, the Hittites differed from their Oriental neighbors and resembled the Greeks¹⁶. Their historical records are not mere royal braggadocio. The kings tell of their defeats as well as of their victories, and credit is given to generals in command of the royal armies. Furthermore, the names and the birthplaces of the authors of the documents are scrupulously recorded. In short, a value is set upon persons other than the king.

In the second place, the organization of the Hittite Empire was feudal. The king makes treaties with his vassals, in which they swear that they will treat his enemies as their enemies and his friends as their friends. The sovereign feels, furthermore, that just as his vassals are equals, so he is an equal of the other great kings—the kings of Babylon, Egypt, Mitanni, Assyria, and—Achaea.

In view of the feudal organization of the Hittite Empire, we shall probably have to take more seriously than we have done the feudal empire of Agamemnon that Homer pictures. Greece in Homeric times was something more than a group of independent mon-

¹⁶Emil Forrer, *Mitteilungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft* 61 (1921), 21-22, 35-36.

archies, which might unite for a special purpose under a leader chosen for the occasion. Agamemnon was probably the feudal overlord of Achilles and Odysseus at home as well as over seas.

This conclusion becomes practically certain when we find the Hittite monarchs mentioning as their equals, that is as great kings like the kings of Egypt and Babylon, certain kings of Achchijavā, for that is about as near as Hittite cuneiform could come to Greek Ἀχαιῶν¹⁷. Pamphilia, whose language was a Greek dialect in historic times, was a part of this realm, and so was Lazpas (= Λέσβος); but another part of it lay 'across the sea'. Its king is said to be Ajavalas, i. e. Αἰφολός. Apparently the first Achaean king to be recognized as 'brother' by the Hittite Monarch was Antravas, i. e. Ἀνδρεῦς, who ruled from about 1350 to 1325 B. C. Presumably he was the first to bring the Achaean State into contact with the Hittites. His successor, almost certainly his son, was Tavaglavas. His name represents Greek Ἐτεροκλέφης very well, except for the initial vowel.

If anyone is disposed to doubt that we really have here a record of Greek kings who ruled over many cities and the islands of the sea before the time of Agamemnon, he may turn to Pausanias 9.34 and read of Andreus, the founder of the Minyan kingdom of Orchomenus, and his son and successor, Eteocles.

The only other king of Achaea so far discovered in the Hittite documents is Attarissijas, who, in the third quarter of the thirteenth century, fought against vassals of the Hittite king in Caria and Cyprus. To judge by linguistic conditions in historic times, Achaean arms finally prevailed in Cyprus, but not in Caria. The records do not indicate that Attarissijas definitely subjected either place. Unfortunately, the name Attarissijas is not clearly equivalent to anything Greek. Forrer identifies it with Ἀτρεῖς, but he does not explain why the Hittites did not make Atravas out of Ἀτρεῖς, just as they made Antravas out of Ἀνδρεῖς. Furthermore, tradition does not connect Atravas with Cyprus or Caria.

That Greek influence was strong in Asia Minor in the fourteenth century B. C. is shown by the name of Alaksandus, king of Vilusa, whose treaty of fealty to the Hittite king has been discovered. That the name Alaksandus must be Ἀλέξανδρος in foreign dress was seen by Luckenbill¹⁸ soon after the name became known. Kretschmer¹⁹ shows that it cannot very well be a Hittite or Luvian cognate of the Greek name, since the initial vowel of this root is not found outside of Greek (compare Sanskrit raks). It does not follow that Alaksandus was a Greek; his parents may have borrowed the name from Greek neighbors or they may have translated a native name into Greek. But, in any case, we must conclude that Greek civilization was

in a fair way to impose itself upon Asia Minor at that early date.

Kretschmer points out that Vilusa, the name of Alaksandus's capital, has a form that might naturally appear in Hittite cuneiform for 𐎶𐎵𐎶𐎶. Vilusa is situated in the region called Arzawa by the Hittites, and Kretschmer thought it necessary to follow Forrer and others in identifying Arzawa with Cilicia. He therefore assumed that legends about Alexander of Vilios were carried from Cilicia to the Troad by the migrations which he long ago inferred from other data.

It now appears²⁰, however, that the Hittite name Arzawa designates all Western Asia Minor. There seems to be no reason, therefore, why we may not identify Vilusa with Ilios. Apparently Priam's son was not the first prince of the land of Troy to translate his name into Greek as Ἀλέξανδρος.

YALE UNIVERSITY

EDGAR H. STURTEVANT

THREE MODERN LATIN EPIGRAMMATISTS¹

Neo-Latin verse far exceeds in volume all our extant Latin poetry from the classical period. The main credit for the work of conserving this Latin verse must go to Janus Gruterus, who, a little more than three centuries ago, began the work of its compilation, selection, and publication. Under the anagrammatic name Ranutius G(h)erus he prepared an edition of two hundred Neo-Latin poets of Italy, which was published, in 1608, at Leyden. Those of France followed in 1609; those of Germany (by "A. F. G. G.") in 1612; those of Belgium in 1614; those of Hungary (by Pareus) in 1618. As pendants to the collection those of Scotland (by Arthur Johnston) came out at Amsterdam, in 1637, and those of Denmark (by F. Rostgaard) in Leyden, in 1693. Holberg very appropriately says that to Rostgaard "ob servatos tot cives, qui alias forsitan periissent, civica corona debetur", words that apply with equal force to the other editors of the series, more especially to Gruter. This made a total of twenty volumes. To this should be added the Latin poetry of these several nations written after the dates mentioned above, as well as that written in countries for which no compilations had been made, namely England, Wales, Ireland, the Scandinavian and Spanish Peninsulas, and perhaps America.

Out of the various departments comprised in this sum that of the epigram is presented to your attention because it consists of a large number of small units each complete in itself, each with a high degree of technical excellence, as well as of general interest. Out of a large number of Neo-Latin epigrammatists I present to your attention three that stand to one another in a very intimate relationship, representing three successive generations; John Owen, *avus*; Henrik Harder, *pater*;

¹⁷See Emil Forrer, *Mitteilungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft* 63 (1924), 1-22.

¹⁸D. D. Luckenbill, A Possible Occurrence of the Name Alexander in the Boghaz-Keui Tablets, *Classical Philology* 6 (1911), 85-86.

¹⁹Paul Kretschmer, Der König Alaksandus von Vilusa, *Glotta* 13 (1924), 205-213.

²⁰See Albrecht Götze, *Kleinasiens zur Hethiterzeit*, 14-28 (Heidelberg, Winter, 1924).

¹This paper was read at the Eighteenth Annual Meeting of The Classical Association of the Atlantic States, held at The Episcopal Academy, Overbrook, Pennsylvania, on May 3, 1924. In the present form of the paper, only the parts that dealt with Owen and Harder are presented. The part that was concerned with Holberg will appear later, in an expanded form, in THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY

Ludvig Holberg, *filius*. They all trace their literary lineage back to their common ancestor Martial, but in their veins flows the blood of most of the great writers of antiquity. Each contributes not a little original thought; each also makes full use of the resources of his predecessors, investing it in new combinations. The most skillful of the three in building up a theme promulgated by his predecessors is Holberg, and not a few of his epigrams are unfoldings, or up-buildings, or rebuildings of themes of Martial, or of Owen, or of Harder.

On the other hand, the greatest of the three as a writer of the short, sharp epigram is Owen, whose life coincides almost exactly with that of Shakespeare, and who, in the reign of James I, more particularly in 1606, 1607, 1612 (bis), published, in four instalments, in ten books, a total of about two thousand epigrams². He has had the greatest influence of them all, an influence manifested not only in the British isles, but also on the continent from Spain to Scandinavia, in imitation as well as in translation. Holberg, in the first instalment of his own epigrams, published in 1737, says, "Omnium manibus feruntur Oweni epigrammata, nonnumquam in ipsis scholis juventuti explicantur". Indeed, it has been established that in the Wickham School at Winchester, which Owen attended in preparation for Oxford, Latin composition in the form of writing elegiac couplets was an actual requirement. Thus was his genius early discovered and primed. Owen had an immense vogue in contrast to his present-day neglect. I say present-day neglect, for the last edition of him was published exactly a century ago, and up to the time when I began to read him (I first got acquainted with him through following up Holberg) I can remember only two instances in which I heard his words quoted. In fact, when first I heard them quoted, I did not know their source, and since that time I have found not a few distinguished comrades in ignorance. These quotations (neither of them exact) are *Tempora mutantur et nos mutamur in illis*, and *Bis dat, qui cito dat*.

Owen was, as stated above, the great master of the short, sharp epigram³ ("quick venew of wit; snip, snap, quick and home"), and here he is not surpassed even by Martial himself. As we read his couplets,

²A fine article on Owen is that by Professor Edward Bensly in *The Cambridge History of English Literature*, Volume 4, Chapter XIII (Robert Burton, John Barclay and John Owen), with its valuable bibliography of Owen (pages 502 ff.). Bensly points out the influence of Owen on other modern Latin epigrammatists, including Harder, but shows no knowledge of the equally great influence exerted by Owen on Holberg. Citations in this paper are according to the edition of Renouard (Paris, 1794).

³Lessing's celebrated *Zerstreute Anmerkungen über das Epigramm und Einige Der Vornehmsten Epigrammatisten* (1771) contains the following impression concerning Owen: "Bei keinem Epigrammatisten aber ist mir wenigstens die ähnliche Abwechslung von Empfindungen lästiger geworden, als bei dem Owen. Nur dass bei diesem der Pedant sich unzählige öfter hören lässt, als der feine Mann von Erfahrung, und dass der Pedant mit aller Gewalt noch oben drein witzig sein will. Ich halte den im allem Ernste für einen starken Kopf, der ein ganzes Buch des Owens in einem Zuge lesen kann, ohne drehend und schwindlicht zu werden. Ich werde es unfehlbar, und habe immer dieses für die einzige Ursache gehalten, weil so grosse Menge bloss allgemeiner Begriffe, die unter sich keine Verbindung haben, in so kurzer Zeit auf einander folgen; die Einbildung möchte jeden gern, in eben der Geschwindigkeit, in ein individuelles Bild verwandeln, und erliegt endlich unter der vergeblichen Bemühung". Strangely enough I feel that way about the few Latin epigrams that Lessing wrote, so true is it that imitation is the sincerest form of flattery.

they show no effort in composition, but Owen himself has told us (1.168) how much labor they cost: "*Crede mihi, labor est non levis esse brevem*". A favorite butt for epigram ever since the time of Martial, if not before, is furnished by the physicians and the lawyers. In one of his cleverest pentameters (1.71) Owen tells what relief they give us, and what we give them: *Dant patienter opem, dum potiantur opum*. In another place (9.96) he throws in some of the theologians for good measure:

*Aegrotant medici, fraudantur iureperiti,
Descendunt multi in tartara theiologi.*

One of his best nonsense epigrams is that entitled *Furca* (5.67):

*Latronum finis funis, mors ultima merces;
Furca capit fures, hinc puto nomen habet.
At multi evasere? dabit Deus his quoque funem;
Rarus funesto fur sine fune perit.*

A frequently quoted thought (descended from Pubilius Syrus) occurs in 8.72, *Ad Ponticum*:

*Nil mihi das: donabis, ais, post funera: quare
Non moreris? bis dat, Pontice, qui cito dat.*

His epigram on the cycle of change (4.174), beginning with the famous line of Horace (*Ars Poetica* 70), shows discriminative judgment:

*Multa renascentur, quae jam cecidere, cadentque
Dogmata, quae summo nunc in honore vigent.
Quae nova sunt hodieque placent, non usque placebunt.
Cur ita? quae nova sunt, non nova semper erunt.*

His appreciation of life's tragicomedy is well expressed in 3.146, *Omnia vanitas*:

*Defleret mores, si viveret Heraclitus;
Nostraque rideret tempora Democritus.
Quamquam ad ridendum curas et inania mundi,
Splenis Democritus non satis unus habet.
Ad casus hominum lacrimarum rore rigandos,
Heraclite, oculi non satis ambo tui⁴.*

His lines in praise of Thomas Neville, his patroness's son (1.6.3-4), run thus:

*Qui puerum laudat, spem non rem laudat in illo;
Non spes, ingenium res probat ipsa tuum.*

This thought is really based on one of Cicero, as given by Servius on *Aeneid* 6.877.

Very fine are his lines to Sir Francis Drake (2.39. 3-4):

*Si taceant homines, facient te sidera notum,
Atque polus de te discet uterque loqui.*

His lines to Sir Philip Sidney (2.29) are really a versification of the beginning of one of Pliny's *Vesuvius* letters (6.16.3):

*Qui scribenda facit, scribitve legenda, beatus
Ille; beator es tu, quod utrumque facis.
Digna legi scribis, facis et dignissima scribi:
Scripta probant doctum te, tua facta probum.*

Among the finest of his epigrams to classical authors is that to Plato (2.156):

*Quae primum in labris pueri sedere Platonis,
In libris resident usque Platonis apes.*

Many of the greatest authors and scholars of the early modern age figure in his epigrams, e. g. Montaigne in 10.28 (apparently altered by Renouard);

⁴It is probably the influence of this epigram that produced Holberg's First Satire, entitled "Democritus and Heraclitus".

Sir Thomas More in 5.54 and 2.152; Erasmus in 2.85, 4.104, 6.92, 7.34; Justus Lipsius in 5.47, where it is brought out that the first instalment of Owen's epigrams was published in the year in which Lipsius died (1606)—"nox tua, nostra dies". Joseph Justus Scaliger is mentioned in 4.110 and in 11.7, and especially in 1.16, an epigram, which, entitled *O tempora, o mores*, has reference to Scaliger's great work on chronology, *De Emendatione Temporum*:

Scaliger annosi correxerat tempora mundi.

Quis jam, qui mores corrigat, alter erit?

2.18, *Ad magnificos Venetos*, runs thus:

Imperii Emporii (mirum) fundamina vestri

Funditus in fluido sunt solidata salo.

Ne solum mutis habitentur piscibus undae,

Aequoris incultas incoluistis aquas.

Orbis in Oceano quae quondam pars fuit, urbs est:

Natura ante salum quod fuit, arte solum.

Imperio sedem hanc aeterno plus prope vobis

Quam sibi constantem constituistis aquam.

Quid mirum vestram consistere legibus urbem,

Legibus exleges cum teneatis aquas?

We pursue the influence of Owen to the continent, more particularly to Denmark. Henrik Harder (1642-1683) was born at Flensburg, in Schleswig, and was educated at Copenhagen. He was tutor at Finstrup, and, later, Secretary of the Danish Embassy in London. His epigrams, totalling nearly five hundred, were published in three books, in the second volume of Rostgaard, *Deliciae Poetarum Quorundam Danorum* (Leyden, 1693), referred to above. Harder was the great master of the panegyric epigram, the greatest poet in our trio. The reading of his epigrams gives the impression of a very fine personality. He used all the meters employed by Martial, except the insignificant Ionic a Minore, and several others besides, mostly in epodal form, all of them with great flexibility and grace. In this he is to be compared to the Scotchman George Buchanan, by whom, as well as by Owen, he was deeply influenced. Holberg's estimate of him (*Praefatio*, pages 234-235) should be quoted:

Fateor nobis non defuisse epigrammatum scriptores. Instar omnium mihi est Harderus, quem ipsi Oweno ob acumina, sales, et elegantiam styli praeferre non dubitavi. Sed paucula tantum istius auctoris in eo genere extant epigrammata, plurima enim panegyrica sunt, licet tanta arte ac venere concinnata, ut inimitabilia mihi fere videantur.

His first book deals exclusively with biblical themes, which thus came into the epigram even as they previously had come into dramatic, epic, and lyric poetry. The epigrams on biblical themes are some of them very impressive in their solemnity; others are of the nonsense variety that our young fellows sing on the subject of Adam, Noah, Jonah, Samson, Goliath, and so on. One of his best nonsense epigrams is the address of Solomon to his wives, in answer to their petition that he worship their gods and install their worship in Jerusalem (1.49):

Non Reor Isacidum meruit, non Astharot aras,

Nec mea Niliacus templa profanat Apis.

Vos ego sidereo conceptae semine formae,

Vos, licet invadeant numina vestra, colam.

Non placet hoc, vestrosque deos mavultis adorem?

Pareo, sed quamvis pareo, malo deas.

Other pieces worth quoting are the following:

1.66, *Ora et labora*:

Ut felix sit opus tuum precare,

Ut felix sit opus tuum labora.

Ceu nil proficerent preces labora,

Ceu nil proficeret labor precare.

2.52, *Occasio*:

Res opportuna tardus si negligis hora,

Horaque resque perit; dum prope res properes.

2.146, *In Phebilum*:

Desertor ille literarum Phebilus

Tam tarda questus literarum praemia,

Ferulae manum jam liberam subdlexerat.

Et mox initiatus sacris Laverniis

Arti studebat isti, quae cultoribus

Labore in ipso dat laboris praemium.

Sed studia cruda cum novus fur et minus

Matura coepit in forum propellere,

Deprensus in foro et notatus stigmatibus

Invitus en rudisque literatus est.

3.94, *Apellis Epitaphium*:

Qui simulare ipsam callebat imagine vitam,

Mortuus est neque jam scit simulare necem.

3.93, *Lingua Anglicana*:

Perfectam Veneris faciem picturus Apelles

Virgineos tota legit in orbe greges.

Quicquid in electis pulchrum vel amabile formis

Repperit, in Paphiae transtulit ora deae.

Excessit nova forma modum; se pluribus una

Debuit, at cunctis pulchrior una fuit.

Effigies Veneris, quam sic collegit Apelles,

Effigies linguae est illa, Britanne, tuae.

3.153, *Ad lectorem*:

An bona sint noster quae carmina fudit Apollo

Nescio; quod nova sint, lector amice, scio.

Omne novum pulchrum non arbitror esse bonumque,

Omne bonum tamen hoc tempore paene novum.

Owen and Harder frequently built their epigrams on an anagram, Owen sometimes carrying the structure even to the fifth degree (6.12). While the practice is not one to be recommended, the following epigram of Harder (2.112) may be cited as probably the best of its class:

LUTETIA PARISIORUM

PARIS: RAPIS

Urbs orbis communis amor; quodcumque bonorum

Tota Europa tenet, tu rapis una Paris.

Urbs orbis commune malum, quodcumque novorum

Inficiat mundum, tu paris una Paris.

Vergil's art in his construction of the Dido episode seems to have been debated in those days even as in our own, and I cite here as interesting the fine epigram of George Buchanan (2.14, Dido):

Casta, decens, generosa animi, Phoenissa peregrini

Femina, magnanimis vix imitanda viris.

At tu sacratam, Maro, labe aspergere famam

Conaris, famae non sine labe tuae.

This epigram probably was in the mind of Harder as he wrote 2.98, Dido:

Quis potuit nostri maculare pudoris honorem

Non fuit Aeneas ille. Quis ergo? Maro.

2.124.3-4:

Ipse pudicitiae Maro labem aspersit Elissae,

Cui male notitiam non mala fama dedit.

Interesting is 3.27, *Avari Cujusdam Epitaphium*:

Hic situs est, qui, cum per pharmaca vivere posset,
 Parceret ut nummis, maluit ipse mori.
 Nunc reor optaret vitam, si scire liceret
 Impensas tantas funeris esse sui.

His finest is that to the astronomer Tycho Brahe
 (3.71):

Exilio felix et raro nomine notus,
 Hic jaceo patriae crimen honorque meae.
 Coelitus orta mei potior pars reddita coelo est;
 Fama quoque ex astris venit, ad astra redit.

Finally, I beg to present illustrations of epigrams that handled anew a theme that had been treated before. The new treatment may be undertaken to improve the thought or the form of the old, or it may give to the thought a different turn, carrying this so far as to reach at times a conclusion opposite to that reached by the earlier writer. In some cases the later writer might almost be thought to be guilty of plagiarism, but fuller consideration will show that such a charge could not be maintained, for the liberty that was enjoyed by Martial and Ausonius to restate a theme that had been treated before them must not be withheld from Owen, or Harder, or Holberg. The greatest master of the thematic epigram was Holberg, but there are some fine examples also in Harder and Owen. In fact, Owen's most quoted epigram is a thematic epigram, whose original was written by Matthaeus Bōrbonius (*Deliciae Poetarum Germanorum*, 1.685):

Omnia mutantur, nos et mutamur in illis,
 Illa vices quasdam res habet, illa vices.

This was the motto of the Emperor Lothaire I. In Owen (8.58) this appears in the following form:

Tempora mutantur nos et mutamur in illis.
 Quomodo? Fit pejor tempore semper homo.

About Owen's improvement of the first line there can be no doubt. Indeed, the improvement has gone on still further, and the trajectory of *nos* and *et* in the form in which this line is usually quoted, *Tempora mutantur et nos mutamur in illis*, has made it unmetrical! Harder has a variation of Martial 10.47, *vitam quae faciant beatorem*, in 2.145. In *Linum discipulum ingratiissimum*:

Vitam quae faciunt beatorem,
 Et vulgi rudis eximunt tenebris;
 Linguas sacra scientias et artes
 Phileno didicit Linus magistro,
 Sed turpes imitaretur cucullos,
 Et tantum facere ac loqui, Phileno
 Vitam quae faciunt acerborem;
 Hoc Lino didicit Linus magistro.

Martial's thought in 7.85.3-4,

Facile est epigrammata belle
 scribere, sed librum scribere difficile est,

meets with the following reaction from Harder (2.121):

Unum epigramma bonum facilis conscribere res est,
 Marcus ait, libros scribere difficile.
 Nunc epigramma bonum quam multis vaticibus unum
 Difficile est, libros scribere perfacile?

Owen 8.26, In intestatum Colinum,

Nil moriens, Coline, tuis das; omnia linquis:
 Parcus eras vivens; porcus eras moriens,

is thus expanded by Harder, 2.142, *Porcus et parcus*:

Currit arat pugnat fert pondera nosque caballus;
 Mellificatis aves, vellera fertis oves.
 Ampla revertentes implent mulctralia vaccae.
 Ubera plena domum grata capella refert.
 Bos arat, ova parit gallina, at pervigil anser
 Scribit, habent cervi cornua, carmen aves.
 At sus vivit iners similisque est solus avaro:
 Ille sui similis nil juvat ante necem.

UNIVERSITY OF UTAH ANDREW RUNNI ANDERSON

REVIEWS

The Monumentum Ancyranum. Edited by E. G. Hardy. Oxford, At the Clarendon Press; New York, Oxford University Press, American Branch (1923). Pp. 167.

In this edition of the Monumentum Ancyranum, or to give it its ancient title, the Res Gestae Divi Augusti, the veteran Oxford scholar, Mr. E. G. Hardy, has renewed one of his earlier scholarly activities, that of presenting outstanding Latin documents with translations and commentaries. His earlier works of this type were the well-known Six Roman Laws, published in 1911 (see THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 6.46), and Three Spanish Charters and Other Documents (Oxford, 1912). The form of presentation in the volume under review deviates somewhat from that followed in the earlier books. Here Mr. Hardy gives the Greek and Latin texts by sentences, each sentence followed by an English version and extensive explanatory comments. The result of this method of treatment upon the prospective student will probably be an unfortunate diffusion of interest and an inability to grasp as a unit certain facts which Augustus himself obviously placed in sequence in order to produce a unified impression upon those who would read the record. In this connection it is always to be remembered that the Res Gestae Divi Augusti, as it has come down to us, is a purposeful political statement left by a cool-headed man, ripened in experience of statecraft and administration by the multifarious duties of ruling the Mediterranean world through forty years and more. It was composed towards the beginning of one of the most important and interesting experiments in unified and organized control of a widespread mass of human beings that the world has known. Therefore the purpose of Augustus Caesar in writing and publishing this account of his work, when and as he published it, his design in presenting with a skill which precludes the idea of frankness the legal basis of his actions, the reasons which prompted him to suppress some facts and to emphasize others are questions which lie at the bottom of any attempt to understand the Res Gestae itself, or the talented and important historical personality from whom the account emanated. To the reviewer it seems a serious omission that Mr. Hardy has not even stated the problem as to what Augustus was trying to do. Any scholar may be justified in deciding that no attempt to answer this particular question can reach a definitive conclusion. That is beside the point. The problem is there; and it is of the utmost importance. Every scholar who handles the Res

Gestae is obligated to state the question and to take a stand over against it.

The reviewer finds no mention, either in the Preface or in the Commentary of Mr. Hardy's edition, of the work of Ernst Kornemann upon the composition of the *Res Gestae*. At the present time the Unitarians in classical scholarship in the United States seem in general to hold the field triumphantly against the Chozizontes. But the *Res Gestae* is obviously not the result of one sitting at the imperial desk of Augustus, nor the work of any one year, as Augustus seems to profess (Chapter 34, *cum scripsi haec, annum agebam septuagenseimum sextum*). Granted, as I for one certainly do grant, that Kornemann's successive articles in *Klio*, now available in book form¹, are quite artificial in their attempt to separate the *Res Gestae* into its component parts, granted that his excess of critical acumen has overreached itself in trying to fix the time of composition of each part and the consequent revisions of sections previously written, Kornemann has nevertheless done a great service in emphasizing the fact that the document was not composed at one time, and he has emphasized it with such a wealth of detail, however mistaken it may be, that the question should no longer be passed over in silence.

This omission, and the complete absence of a bibliography, must be noted. Perhaps it would be unfair to regard these matters as defects. Professedly the work was not intended by its author to be one which would cover the rather extensive recent literature upon the subject of the *Monumentum Ancyranum*. It arose out of the needs of the author's own students at Oxford and was clearly designed to meet those particular needs. From the point of view of the needs of American students the lack, both in the Greek and in the Latin texts, of the editorial signs usually employed to indicate lacunae, restorations, and the like will scarcely recommend it for use by us. This edition of the *Res Gestae* is nevertheless welcome as embodying the results of the author's own intensive study of the text and the related ancient sources which bear upon it. With these sources Mr. Hardy shows that wide and thorough acquaintance which we have learned to expect from his previous editions. The conclusions which he draws from conflicting evidence show clarity and sanity of judgment. It is superfluous to add that the reviewer has no fault to find with the translation. To one statement in the Preface the reviewer, does, however, take exception, namely, that "no English edition of the *Res Gestae* had so far existed" when Mr. Hardy was preparing his edition. Dr. William Fairley's critical edition, with translation, appeared in the *Translations and Reprints from the Original Sources of European History*, Published by The Department of History of the University of Pennsylvania, Volume V, No. 1, just a quarter of a century before Mr. Hardy's edition. And it was a good piece of work!

In the discussion of Chapter VIII (pages 54-60) Mr. Hardy contributes a new and interesting idea in his

attempt to reconcile conflicting statements of Augustus himself and Dio Cassius. Augustus states that he had made a revision of the Senate three times and had taken the census three times. Dio gives four censuses which were combined with revisions of the Senate lists. Mr. Hardy's contribution lies in the ingenious suggestion that in both sources these two activities, census-taking and senate-revision, are to be separated. By assuming errors of dating in Dio's account, an assumption that is thoroughly warranted, he presents a rather convincing argument that the two things occurred together in 29-28 B. C., and in rotation thereafter through the first principate.

Mr. Hardy calls attention in his Preface (8-9) to the new fragments of the *Res Gestae* discovered by Sir William Ramsay at Antioch, in Pisidia, in 1914. Further additions to the Latin version were found during the summer of 1924, on the same site, by the Sir William Ramsay—Francis W. Kelsey—David M. Robinson archaeological expedition. An account of these fragments was presented, in December last, before the American Philological Association, at Chicago, by Professor Robinson. The forthcoming publication of his results will be awaited with the keenest interest by all students of the Classics and of ancient history. For it is quite true that the *Res Gestae Divi Augusti* is the 'Queen of Inscriptions', as Mommsen said long since.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY WILLIAM LINN WESTERMANN

Examination Papers on Caesar, Nepos, Grammar, Composition. Being Part VI of First Latin. By John D. Warnock. Cleveland: The University Supply and Book Co. (1924). Pp. ix + 54. 50 cents.

Those who have found Dr. Warnock's earlier pamphlet, *First Latin* (1916), of use in the Caesar class for purposes of drill and review will welcome the appearance of this recent addition, laden with a cargo of fresh material. The contents consist of fifty examination papers. The first five are devoted mostly to grammar and to composition. The remaining forty-five are similar in their form to the College Entrance Examination Board's examination Cp. 2 (Caesar)—a short passage or two of Latin, some questions on grammar and syntax, and three or four sentences for prose composition. The Latin passages are taken from Caesar, B. G. 1-8, B. C. 1-3, *De Bello Africano*, *De Bello Alexandrino*, and Nepos, Leonidas and Hannibal. Dr. Warnock has roamed far afield for his material: hence his collection contains exhibits not only from the more familiar domestic institutions, such as the College Entrance Examination Board, the New York Regents, Dartmouth College, University of Illinois, but also from the Education Committee of Quebec, University of Toronto, Oxford University, University of London, Education Department of Queensland, University of Melbourne, etc. Many of the papers are 'composites'—arranged so as better to suit the purpose for which they are intended.

A booklet of this kind provides a practical and well-tested means of review for the last months of the Caesar

¹*Mausoleum und Tatenbericht des Augustus* (Teubner, Leipzig, 1921. Pp. iv + 107). For a review of the book see *Classical Philology* 16, 201-202.

course, and is especially useful to teachers whose classes are preparing for impending College examinations. For those who cannot fit it into their schedule in this way it still offers not only a kind of standard of attainment, established by measurements over a wide area, but also a ready supply of test material suitable for immediate application.

GRADUATE COLLEGE,
PRINCETON, N. J.

JOHN W. SPAETH, JR.

Aristotle. By W. D. Ross. London: Methuen and Company (1923). Pp. vii + 300.

Where does Professor Ross find the time, not to mention the energy, for so much exacting and excellent work? Now almost single-handed he edits the Oxford Translation of Aristotle, volume after volume, in which the separate translators continually bear witness to his helping hand. He has also been preparing his own edition of the *Metaphysics*, a notable undertaking even among those that have issued from the school of Bywater. Either task would seem to be enough for one scholar within the space, say, of a decade. Meanwhile he has the duties of a tutor in Oriol College; and the demands upon a tutor at Oxford usually are not light. Nevertheless, as a mere side-issue, he writes for a London publisher an extensive and detailed survey of Aristotle—of the man and his writings—that is the best account of its subject in English. It is a solid, competent, extremely useful volume. In fact, so far as I know, there is nothing comparable to it, for aim and scope, in any language; it obviously outruns the measure of the encyclopedias, adheres more rigorously than the older books to the actual statements of Aristotle, and, of course, takes advantage of the more recent special investigations. The author says in his Preface:

"There are several types of book about Aristotle which it would be interesting to write and perhaps not unprofitable to read. In one, it might be shown how almost the whole of his thought is a mosaic of borrowings from his predecessors, and yet is transformed by the force of his genius into a strikingly original system. In another, the attempt might be made to trace the chronological development of his thought; this has recently been done with marked success by Prof. W. Jaeger, in a book to which I should have owed much more had it reached me before mine was in the press. In another, the penetrating influence of Aristotle on subsequent philosophy might be followed down the centuries. I have not attempted any of these tasks, but have tried simply to give an account of the main features of his philosophy as it stands before us in his works. I have written little by way of criticism. . . . What is true in Aristotle has become part, and no small part, of the heritage of all educated men; what is false has been gradually rejected, so that explicit criticism is now hardly necessary."

The extant writings of Aristotle in the main are highly condensed, and their style is often crabbed; any elaboration in them is likely to concern some minor point, and not a major principle that was familiar to his students. An attempt to condense them further does not promise easy reading; and hence this new book faces the inevitable charge of aridity—above all, in its exposition of the treatises on logic. It is, however, admirably arranged, and as lucid as it well could be, and is readable enough in places where the firm and manly style of the interpreter has a margin of freedom—as in the opening chapter, which is entitled *Life and Works*.

The remaining eight chapters successively deal with individual works of Aristotle, or with groups of them, under the headings Logic; Philosophy of Nature; Biology; Psychology; Metaphysics; Ethics; Politics; Rhetoric and Poetics. These are followed by a Short

Bibliography, a Chronology of the Peripatetic School, and, we are thankful to say, an Index.

In this review I shall not attempt to condense a condensation of Aristotle. But I do not wish to imply that the book is nothing more than an ordinary work of reference. It will serve various ends. Thus it will be good for occasional consultation; it will likewise be useful to the student who, with a special interest in some one part of Aristotle's writings, needs to see that part against the background of other activities, and of the activity as a whole, of the master of them that know.

My own special interest would lead me to pick flaws, if there were any, in the last chapter, on the Rhetoric and the Poetics; but that would be ungracious and mainly unwarranted. At the end it is rightly said that the Poetics "contains perhaps a greater number of pregnant ideas on art than any other book"; the vital quality of the treatise is duly noted. And there is something to be learned from Professor Ross on the subject of the tragic *catharsis*, though I doubt if there ever existed an explicit discussion of the term in a lost book of the Poetics; see my review of Alfred Gudeman, *Aristoteles Über die Dichtkunst, Neu Übersetzt*, *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 17:56-57. Nor do I believe that Antigone was fated to hang herself before she could eat up the food she had with her in the tomb.

The brief and grudging treatment that is accorded to the Rhetoric, and the reasons that are given for this brevity, will strike many of us with dismay. In rejoinder we may quote the excerpt from Copleston that is prefixed to the translation by Jebb:

"The Treatise on Rhetoric is a magazine of intellectual riches. . . . Nothing is left untouched, on which Rhetoric, in all its branches, has any bearing. The author's principles are the result of extensive original induction. He sought them, if ever man did seek them, in the living pattern of the human heart. All the recesses and windings of that hidden region he has explored: all its caprices and affections—whatever tends to excite, to ruffle, to amuse, to gratify, or to offend it—have been carefully examined. The reason of these phenomena is demonstrated, the method of creating them is explained. . . . The whole is a textbook of human feeling; a storehouse of taste; an exemplar of condensed and accurate, but uniformly clear and candid reasoning."

One may well imagine that Professor Ross himself has changed his mind, and no longer questions whether the Rhetoric "has now less life in it than most of Aristotle's works"; for more recently he has edited a vital translation, certainly the best in English, by Professor Rhys Roberts. This has just appeared, as part of the Oxford Translation of Aristotle.

CORNELL UNIVERSITY

LANE COOPER

CLASSICAL ARTICLES IN NON-CLASSICAL PERIODICALS

XI

Isis—1924, Review, favorable, by "G. S.", of Hippocrates, translated by W. H. S. Jones (Loeb Classical Library); Review, favorable, by Julius Roska, of Erich Frank, *Plato und die Sogenannten Pythagoreer*; Review, by George Sarton, of Lynn Thorndike, *A History of Magic and Experimental Science during the First Thirteen Centuries of Our Era* [the work is said to deal largely with the Latin world. The title is criticized as being inaccurate—the work is not a true history of experimental science—, and the form as being poor and unfinished. It is evident that altogether the critic does not consider the writer's methods duly scientific; but he says that the book contains valuable information].

Scientia—December, Review, favorable, by Gino Loria, of L. Laurand, *Manuel des Études Grecques et Latines*. Appendice: *Les Sciences dans l'Antiquité*.

HUNTER COLLEGE

E. ADELAIDE HAHN